Power Efficient Hybrid Beamforming for Massive MIMO Public Channel

Cheng Zhang, Yongming Huang, *Member, IEEE,* Yindi Jing, *Member, IEEE,* and Luxi Yang, *Member, IEEE*

arXiv:1704.05405v1 [cs.IT] 18 Apr 2017

***Abstract*—For hybrid massive MIMO public channel with any sector size in either microwave or millimeter wave (mmwave) band, this paper studies the hybrid beamforming optimized to minimize the transmit power while guaranteeing the quality of service (QoS) for randomly deployed users. First the ideal beampattern is derived via Parseval Identity, based on which a beamforming design problem is formulated to minimize the gap with the idea beampattern. The problem is transformable to a multiconvex one and an iterative optimization algorithm is used to obtain the full-digital beamformer. In addition, with the help of same beampattern theorem, the power amplifier (PA) efficiency of the beamformer is improved with unchanged beampattern. Finally, the hybrid beamforming design is obtained that achieves the full-digital beamformer solution. Simulations verifies the advantages of the proposed scheme over existing ones.**

***Index Terms*—Hybrid massive MIMO, public channel, power efficient, beamforming, beampattern.**

I. Introduction

In massive MIMO systems, multi-user beamforming in dedicated channels has been investigated intensively [1], [2]. But designs for public channels are relatively limited. Public channels play crucial roles in broadcasting essential synchronization, reference, and control signals [3]. Since public channels serve all users randomly located in the sector, omnidirectional coverage is desired and the transmission design is generally based on the assumption of no channel state information (CSI) at the base station (BS) [3], [4].

Several beamforming designs have been proposed in existing literature for public channel communications in conventional MIMO systems, e.g., global search, randomization, and communication standard based schemes (see [4] and references therein). Unfortunately, these methods may be incompatible with massive MIMO systems [3]. A new design for massive MIMO public channel can be found in [3]. Based on the large-scale approximation of the channel correlation matrix, Zadoff-Chu (ZC) sequence was utilized to design the beamformer which aims to make the signal powers at M (which is the antenna number at the BS) discrete angles equal. However, for practically large but finite antennas, M discrete angles is insufficient in representing the continuous sector, so the design results in performance degradation for many unobserved angles. Moveover, the ZC scheme is dedicated for the standard sector only, e.g., $[-90^\circ, 90^\circ]$ with the antenna spacing ratio being 0.5, its direct application for the adaptive sectorization scenario according to traffic requirements in 5G communications [5] seems infeasible. In [6], by using the same beampattern theorem [7], a broadbeam design was proposed where a reference beampattern is first determined, then the beamformer is obtained by solving a polynomial equation to approach the reference beampattern. Again, only the standard sector was considered and the polynomial coefficients tend to be inaccurate when the number of observed discrete angles is larger than $2M-1$.

For massive MIMO communications, two practical constraints are emphasized. First, due to the high cost of radio frequency (RF) hardware, especially for the millimeter wave (mmwave) band, having a RF chain for each antenna tends to be infeasible. The hybrid beamforming structure with less RF chains than antennas, e.g., 64 antennas and 16 RF chains, is considered to be cost effective and has little performance loss [8] compared with its full-digital counterpart. Second, the demand for high power efficiency for 5G communications makes both the constraint of total transmit power and the power efficiency of each antenna, e.g., power amplifier (PA) efficiency, important for massive MIMO systems [9].

In this paper, the public channel beamforming design is studied for massive MIMO systems with the power efficient hybrid structure and with any sector size. The problem is formulated as the transmit power minimization under quality of service (QoS) constraint with additional consideration on the PA efficiency. In solving the beamforming design problem, first the ideal beampattern is derived, then a full-digital beamformer optimization is formulated as finding the beamformer whose beampattern has the minimum gap with the idea beampattern. The formulation also explores the inherent tradeoffs among important beampattern parameters with the help of the finite impulse response (FIR) filter theorem. It is shown that an efficient iterative algorithm based on semi-definite programming (SDP) can be used for the optimization. Subsequently, by drawing lessons from [6], [7], we utilize the same beampattern theorem to improve the beamformer's PA efficiency through a search with controllable complexity. Further, this full-digital beamformer is decomposed into the product of a baseband beamformer and an analog beamforming matrix via the triangle construction theorem [9], [10] to be applicable for the hybrid massive MIMO structure. Simulations are shown to validate the efficiency of the proposed design and its superiority over existing schemes.

The main difference of this work with existing ones is two-folds. First, the problem formulation is fundamentally different. In existing work, equal power at some discrete angles is required [3], [6]. Our formulation is from the perspective of the QoS guarantee, the power efficiency, and the hybrid structure. Second, the proposed design procedure explores the ideal beampattern result and the FIR filter theorem. Compared with the ZC scheme [3], the proposed one is not limited to the performance for M discrete angles and is adaptive to the sector size. Compared with the broadbeam design [6], the proposed design does not require artificially predefining the reference beampattern which is non-trivial especially for arbitrary sector size. Moreover, the use of convex optimization tools enables searching over a broader region compared with the polynomial equation solving in [6]. Meanwhile, the strict requirement on the number and locations of the observed discrete angles can also be relaxed with the proposed design.

C. Zhang, Y. Huang, and L. Yang are with the School of Information Science and Engineering, Southeast University, Nanjing 210096, P. R. China (email: zhangcheng1988, huangym, lxyang@seu.edu.cn).

Y. Jing is with the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Canada, T6G 2V4 (email: yindi@ualberta.ca).

II. System Model

Consider a massive MIMO BS with hybrid beamforming structure, where the number of antennas is M and the number of RF chains is N_{RF} ($N_{RF} > 1$). Each antenna has constant gain among $[\Theta_1, \Theta_2]$. To avoid angle ambiguity [11], it is assumed that $\Theta_1 \geq -\pi/2$, $\Theta_2 \leq \pi/2$ for $D \leq 0.5$; and $\Theta_1 \geq -\arcsin\left(\frac{1}{2D}\right)$, $\Theta_2 \leq \arcsin\left(\frac{1}{2D}\right)$ for $D > 0.5$. For the public channel, common messages are transmitted to all users randomly distributed in the sector $\mathcal{A} \triangleq [\Theta_{\min}, \Theta_{\max}] \subseteq [\Theta_1, \Theta_2]$. No CSI is available at the BS.

The received signal at an observed user is

$$y = \sqrt{\rho}\mathbf{h}^H\mathbf{w}x + z, \tag{1}$$

where $\mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{C}^{M\times 1}$ is the channel vector, $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{C}^{M\times 1}$ is the beamformer normalized as $\mathbf{w}^H\mathbf{w} = 1$, ρ is the average transmit power, $x \sim \mathcal{CN}(0,1)$ is the common signal symbol, and $z \sim \mathcal{CN}(0,1)$ is the local noise. With hybrid structure, $\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{W}_{RF}\mathbf{w}_{BB}$, where $\mathbf{W}_{RF} \in \mathbb{C}^{M\times N_{RF}}$ is the analog beamforming matrix with the constraint $|[\mathbf{W}_{RF}]_{i,j}| = 1, \forall i, j$ and $\mathbf{w}_{BB} \in \mathbb{C}^{N_{RF}\times 1}$ is the baseband beamformer.

The spatially correlated channel is considered, i.e.,

$$\mathbf{h} = \mathbf{R}^{1/2}\mathbf{h}^{iid}, \tag{2}$$

where $\mathbf{h}^{iid} \sim \mathcal{CN}(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{I}_M)$ is the fast fading channel component and $\mathbf{R} \in \mathbb{C}^{M\times M}$ is the channel covariance matrix with normalized large-scale fading, i.e., $\mathrm{tr}\{\mathbf{R}\} = M$. The user can have any location within the sector and $\mathbf{R}$ can be modeled as

$$\mathbf{R} = \int_{\Theta_{\max}}^{\Theta_{\max}} f(\theta)\boldsymbol{\alpha}(\theta)\boldsymbol{\alpha}^H(\theta)d\theta, \tag{3}$$

where $f(\theta)$ is the power azimuth spectrum (PAS) [3] satisfying $\int_{\theta_{max}}^{\theta_{min}} f(\theta)d\theta = 1$ and the channel angular (AS) interval $[\theta_{min}, \theta_{max}] \subseteq \mathcal{A}$. Assume uniform linear array (ULA) at the BS[1], the array vector for θ can be represented as

$$\boldsymbol{\alpha}(\theta) = \left[1, ..., e^{-j2\pi D\sin(\theta)(M-1)}\right]^T, \tag{4}$$

where D is the antenna spacing ratio.

Note that the random location of a user is represented by its PAS function $f(\theta)$. For mmwave band, the integration in (3) becomes a summation of finite terms for some discrete angles [8]. This is a special case of (3) to which the following design also applies.

III. Problem Formulation and Solution Procedure

In this section, the beamforming design problem is first formulated. Then the solution procedure is provided.

A. Problem Formulation

For the public channel transmission, the beamforming design needs to guarantee the worst performance within the sector. The outage probability, P_{out}, is chosen to be the performance measure. In addition, the power efficiency is important especially from the perspective of communication carriers. Therefore, the power efficient hybrid beamforming design problem for massive MIMO public channel is formulated as

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{P1}: \underset{\mathbf{w}=\mathbf{W}_{RF}\mathbf{w}_{BB}}{\text{minimize}} \quad & \rho \\
\text{s.t.} \quad & \max_{f(\theta)} \left(P_{out}\left(\rho, R, \mathbf{w}, f(\theta)\right)\right) \leq \bar{P}_{out}, && \text{(C.1)} \\
& |[\mathbf{W}_{RF}]_{i,j}| = 1, \forall i, j, && \text{(C.2)} \\
& \mathbf{w}^H\mathbf{w} = 1. && \text{(C.3)}
\end{aligned}$$

where $\bar{P}_{out}$ is the maximum acceptable outage probability.

Let R be the minimum rate for reliable transmission. Based on (2) and eigen-decomposition of $\mathbf{R}^{1/2,H}\mathbf{w}\mathbf{w}^H\mathbf{R}^{1/2}$, the following derivations on the outage probability can be obtained:

$$\begin{aligned}
P_{out} &= \Pr\left\{\log_2\left(1 + \rho|\mathbf{h}^H\mathbf{w}|^2\right) < R\right\} \\
&= \Pr\left\{\lambda\left|h^{iid}\right|^2 < \frac{2^R - 1}{\rho}\right\},
\end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

where $\lambda = \mathbf{w}^H\mathbf{R}\mathbf{w}$ and $h^{iid} \sim \mathcal{CN}(0,1)$.

Define

$$g(\theta) \triangleq \mathbf{w}^H\boldsymbol{\alpha}(\theta)\boldsymbol{\alpha}^H(\theta)\mathbf{w} \tag{6}$$

which is the *beampattern* at angle θ. It can be shown straightforwardly that $\lambda = \int_{\Theta_{min}}^{\Theta_{max}} f(\theta)g(\theta)d\theta$, which is the *array gain* for the user whose PAS is $f(\theta)$. This shows that the array gain for a user is an integration of the product between the user's PAS and beampattern. By transforming the angle domain θ to the normalized *spatial frequency* domain $\sin(\theta)$, we have

$$\lambda = \int_{\sin(\Theta_{min})}^{\sin(\Theta_{max})} f\left(\arcsin(x)\right) g\left(\arcsin(x)\right) \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-x^2}} dx. \tag{7}$$

1) Additional requirement: Besides minimizing the transmit power, another important factor affecting the system power efficiency is the PA efficiency which is quantified by the peak-to-average power ratio (PAPR) in this paper, i.e.,

$$\delta = \frac{M\max_m |w_m|^2}{\|\mathbf{w}\|^2}. \tag{8}$$

A way to incorporate power efficiency is to directly set a constraint on the PAPR in P1, or formulate a double-objective problem by adding the minimization of δ. But this makes the problem intractable [12]. Alternatively, we provide an indirect solution for this requirement and make it as an additional consideration. More details are provided in Section III-B and IV-C.

B. Solution Procedure

To solve P1 directly is difficult and give reasons since (C.2) is non-convex and intractable. The following procedure with four steps is this proposed:

1) Find the optimal beampattern, $g^\star(\theta)$ to minimize transmit power under the outage probability constraint only.
2) Find a full-digital beamformer, $\mathbf{w}_1^\star$, whose beampattern closely matches the optimal one found in Step 1.
3) Find a beamformer $\mathbf{w}_2^\star$ with the same beampattern as that of $\mathbf{w}_1^\star$ but a lower PAPR.
4) Decompose $\mathbf{w}_2^\star$ into $\mathbf{W}_{RF}^\star$ and $\mathbf{w}_{BB}^\star$ to complete the hybrid beamforming design.

In the following sections, details of each step will be provided. Step 3 is used to improve the PA efficiency of

[1]Our results can be straightforwardly extended to other antenna array topologies such as uniform planar arrays or uniform circular arrays.

the object beamformer. If Steps 1, 2, and 4 can be solved precisely, especially for Step 2, i.e., a full-digital beamformer whose beampattern is the same as $g^{\star}(\theta)$ can be found, the procedure will lead the optimal solution of P1. However, as will be explained in the following sections, Steps 1 and 4 can be solved precisely, but due to the FIR filter theorem, the ideal beampattern is unattainable given the finite dimension of $\mathbf{w}$. Thus, in Step 2, the goal is to find a beamformer whose beampattern closely matches the optimal one.

IV. Solution Details

This section provides the detailed formulations and solutions for the proposed four-step procedure.

A. Ideal Beampattern

The first step is to find the optimal beampattern that minimizes the transmit power under the outage probability constraint. It can be written as the following:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{P2}: \underset{g(\theta)}{\text{minimize}} \quad & \rho \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \max_{f(\theta)} \left(P_{out}\left(\rho, R, g\left(\theta\right), f(\theta)\right)\right) \leq \bar{P}_{out}, \qquad \text{(C.1)} \\ & \mathbf{w}_1^H \mathbf{w}_1 = 1. \qquad \text{(C.3)}\end{aligned}$$

The optimal beampattern $g^{\star}(\theta)$ for P2, also called the *ideal beampattern*, is given in the following lemma.

Lemma 1. *The optimal beampattern for P2 is*

$$g^{\star}\left(\arcsin(x)\right) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{D(\sin(\Theta_{\max})-\sin(\Theta_{\min}))}, & x \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}} \\ 0, & x \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}^{-} \end{cases}, \qquad (9)$$

where $\xi^{\star} \triangleq \left(D(\sin(\Theta_{\max}) - \sin(\Theta_{\min}))\right)^{-1}$ *is the beampattern value within the sector,* $\tilde{\mathcal{A}} \triangleq [\sin(\Theta_{\min}), \sin(\Theta_{\max})]$ *is the sector interval in the spatial frequency domain, and* $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}^{-} \triangleq [\sin(\Theta_1), \sin(\Theta_{\min})) \cup (\sin(\Theta_{\max}), \sin(\Theta_2)]$ *is the out-sector interval.*

Proof. See Appendix A. □

Remark 1. *Ideal beampattern has been used in public channel beamforming design in [3], [6]. But the proposed result in Lemma 1 has distinctions in two aspects. First, beampatterns in [3], [6] are for the standard sector, e.g.,* $\mathcal{A} = [\Theta_1, \Theta_2] = [-90^{\circ}, 90^{\circ}]$ *and* $D = 0.5$ *only; while* $g^{\star}(\theta)$ *is applicable for any sector size* $\mathcal{A} \subseteq [\Theta_1, \Theta_2]$*. Also, the beampattern in [3] is defined for only* M *discrete angles. Second, beampatterns in [3], [6] are derived from the requirement of constant signal power at any discrete angles; while our result links the beampattern to direct communication objects.*

B. Ideal Beampattern Based Beamformer Design

The second step of the solution procedure is to find a full-digital beamformer, $\mathbf{w}_1^{\star}$, whose beampattern closely matches the optimal one. Recall the equivalence between the beampattern and the FIR filter response as shown in (11) of the proof for Lemma 1. Due to the FIR filter theorem [13], there does not exist an M-dimensional vector $\mathbf{w}$ whose beampattern equals $g^{\star}(\theta)$ in (9). Specifically, the ripple in both $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ (pass band) and $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}^{-}$ are unavoidable. Moreover, the transition bandwidth Δ_T should be non-zero[2] in practice. Thus $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}^{-}$ should be divided into two parts, i.e., the transition band and the stop band, in which the latter is $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_s^{-} \triangleq [\sin(\Theta_1), \sin(\Theta_{\min}) - \Delta_T) \cup (\sin(\Theta_{\max}) + \Delta_T, \sin(\Theta_2)]$.

Based on the FIR filter theorem, there is an inherent tradeoff between the ripples in $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ and the size of transition bandwidth Δ_T. Specifically, the ripple size in $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ is inversely proportional to Δ_T and the minimum beampattern decreases with increasing ripple for constant mean beampattern in $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$. On the other hand, due to the Parseval identity used in the proof for Lemma 1, a larger Δ_T may decrease the mean beampattern in $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$, which decreases the minimum beampattern with constant ripple in $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$.

By taking into consideration of the aforementioned phenomenon, in what follows, a formulation for the optimization of the full-digital beamformer is proposed to explore the tradeoff in the equivalent filter design problem.

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{P3}: \underset{\mathbf{w}_1}{\text{minimize}} \quad & \sigma \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \left|\left|\mathbf{w}_1^H \boldsymbol{\alpha}(\arcsin(x))\right| - \sqrt{\xi^{\star}}\right| \leq \sigma, x \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}, \ \text{(C.1)} \\ & \left|\mathbf{w}_1^H \boldsymbol{\alpha}(\arcsin(x))\right| \leq \sqrt{r_s}, x \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_s^{-}, \qquad \text{(C.2)} \\ & 0 < \Delta_T \leq \Delta_T^{max}. \qquad \text{(C.3)} \\ & \mathbf{w}_1^H \mathbf{w}_1 \leq 1. \qquad \text{(C.4)}\end{aligned}$$

In this formulation, the square root of beampattern is used for simplicity. In (C.1), the gap between the beampattern of $\mathbf{w}_1$ and the ideal one ($\xi^{\star}$) in $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ should be lower than σ. In (C.2), to reduce possible inter-sector interference, a constraint on the maximum beampattern r_s in $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_s^{-}$ is required. Also from this perspective, we set another (C.3) on the maximum Δ_T (denoted as Δ_T^{max}). In (C.4), $\mathbf{w}_1^H \mathbf{w}_1 \leq 1$ is the convex relaxation version of $\mathbf{w}_1^H \mathbf{w}_1 = 1$, which does not affect the optimization result since the equality can always be satisfied due to the structure of P3. Note that some finite observed discrete angles within $\tilde{\mathcal{A}} \cup \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_s^{-}$ should be selected for the optimization to be feasible.

Remark 2. *In [6], although the original object is to guarantee the performance of the whole continuous sector, only no more than* $2M - 1$ *carefully designed angles are selected as the observed angles and the optimization is based on these discrete angles only. Since P3 is solved numerically, angle discretization is still needed. But our method allows an arbitrary number of angles and arbitrary selections of observed angles. In fact, for high precision, a large number of observed angles are considered to have a small angle spacing. Meanwhile, the reference beampattern used for the beamforming design in [6] is fixed as* $[-90^{\circ}, 90^{\circ}]$ *only, and its application or extension to another sector size is non-trivial. Our formulation in P3 needs the ideal beampattern only and focuses on the key design requirements. Thus, the proposed design has an enlarged search space and results in the same or better performance. In addition, our scheme is applicable for an arbitrary sector size.*

[2]Exception is for the full-pass filter, i.e., $\tilde{\mathcal{A}} = [\sin(\Theta_1), \sin(\Theta_2))]$.

1) Algorithm Design: In P3, notice that Δ_T only functions via $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_s^-$. In solving P3, we first solve the problem for a given $\Delta_T \in (0, \Delta_T^{max}]$, then conduct a grid search over Δ_T.

The difficulty lies in the non-convex constraint ($\bar{\text{C}}$.1). By drawing lessons from [14], we can transform ($\bar{\text{C}}$.1) to $|(\mathbf{w}_{1,1}+\mathbf{w}_{1,2})^H\boldsymbol{\alpha}(\arcsin(x))| \le \sigma+\sqrt{\xi^\star}$ and $\max\{0, \sqrt{\xi^\star}-\sigma\} \le \sqrt{4\text{Re}\{\mathbf{w}_{1,1}^H\boldsymbol{\alpha}(\arcsin(x))(\mathbf{w}_{1,2}^H\boldsymbol{\alpha}(\arcsin(x)))^H\}}$ where $\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{w}_{1,1} + \mathbf{w}_{1,2}$ [14, Pro. 3.1]. These two new constraints are multiconvex inequalities which is convex in $\mathbf{w}_{1,2}$ for given $\mathbf{w}_{1,1}$ and vice versa. Since ($\bar{\text{C}}$.2) and ($\bar{\text{C}}$.4) are convex, an iterative algorithm based on convex optimization [14, Algorithm II] can be used to efficiently solve P3 for an arbitrarily given Δ_T. The initialization can be obtained by solving the standard semi-definite programming (SDP) problem via relaxing the inner absolute sign of ($\bar{\text{C}}$.1). Due to the space limit and similarity, the pseudo-code and the proof for its convergence (refer to the end of [14, Sec. III]) are omitted here.

Based on the above analysis, the complete algorithm for Step 2 based on a grid search for the transition bandwidth Δ_T is summarized in Algorithm 1, where $\text{d}\Delta_T$ is the step size of Δ_T and g_{min} is the minimum beampattern in $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$.

Algorithm 1 Algorithm for obtaining $\mathbf{w}_1^\star$

```
Input: ξ*, Δ_T^max, dΔ_T, r_s;
Initialization: w_1* = 0; g_min = 0;
for Δ_T = [Δ_T^max, Δ_T^max − dΔ_T, ..., 0) do
    Solve P3 with Δ_T and obtain w̄_1;
    Denote the minimum beampattern in Ã as ḡ_min;
    if ḡ_min > g_min then
        g_min = ḡ_min; w_1* = w̄_1;
    end if
end for
Output: w_1*.
```

C. PAPR Reduction

Step 3 of the solution procedure is to find the beamformer $\mathbf{w}_2^\star$ which has the same beampattern as that of $\mathbf{w}_1^\star$ obtained in Step 2 and has the lowest PAPR. By drawing lessons from [7], $\mathbf{w}_2^\star$ can be found as follows. First, we solve the polynomial equation: $w_{1,1}^\star+w_{1,2}^\star x+w_{1,3}^\star x^2+...+w_{1,M}^\star x^{M-1}=0$. Without loss of geneality, the $M-1$ roots $x_1, x_2, ..., x_{M-1}$ are assumed to be sorted so that $|x_i - 1/x_i^*|$ is in decreasing order. The 2^{M-1} beamformers with the same beampattern as that of $\mathbf{w}_1^\star$ form the set $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathbf{v}|v_1 + v_2x + v_3x^2 + ... + v_Mx^{M-1} = \prod_{m=1}^{M-1}(x-a_m), a_m = x_m \text{ or } 1/x_m^*, m = 1, ..., M-1\}$. Thus, we can search this set to find the one with the smallest PAPR.

If reduction on the search complexity is desired, the reduced set for the candidacy beamformers can be used: $\bar{\mathcal{V}} = \{\bar{\mathbf{v}}|\bar{v}_1 + \bar{v}_2x + \bar{v}_3x^2 + ... + \bar{v}_Mx^{M-1} = \prod_{m=1}^{Q}(x-a_m)\prod_{m=Q+1}^{M-1}(x-a_m)\}$ with $a_m = x_m$ or $1/x_m^*, m = 1, ..., Q$ where $\{a_m, m = Q+1, ..., M-1\}$ is predetermined randomly.

D. Implementation in Hybrid Structure

The last step of the solution procedure is to decompose $\mathbf{w}_2^\star$ found Step 3 into $\mathbf{W}_{RF}^\star$ and $\mathbf{w}_{BB}^\star$ for the hybrid beamforming design. The geometric method in [9] can be used to construct the analog beamforming matrix $\mathbf{W}_{RF}^\star$ and the baseband beamformer $\mathbf{w}_{BB}^\star$ without performance loss for the hybrid structure with $N_{RF} > 1$. First, to make the algorithm [9, Algorithm 1] applicable, we give the following baseband design.

Lemma 2. *By setting* $\mathbf{w}_{BB}^\star = [b, b, ..., b]^T$ *with* $b = \max\{|w_{2,i}^\star|/N_{RF}, i = 1, ..., M\}$, *the sufficient condition of triangle construction [9, Theorem 1] is satisfied for* $\mathbf{w}_2^\star = \mathbf{W}_{RF}^\star\mathbf{w}_{BB}^\star$ *with the constraint* $|[\mathbf{W}_{RF}^\star]_{i,j}| = 1, \forall i, j$.

Proof. For each element of $\mathbf{w}_2^\star$, i.e., $w_{2,i}^\star, i = 1, ..., M$, by sorting $\{w_{2,i}^\star, w_{BB,1}^\star, ..., w_{BB,N_{RF}}^\star\}$ according to their magnitude in decreasing order, we have $|w_{2,i}^\star| \le \sum_{j=1}^{N_{RF}}|w_{BB,j}| = \max\{|w_{2,j}^\star|, j = 1, ..., M\}$ or $|w_{BB,1}| \le \sum_{j=2}^{N_{RF}}|w_{BB,j}| + |w_{2,i}^\star|$ which both satisfy the sufficient condition in [9, Theorem 1] for successful triangle construction. □

With the given $\mathbf{w}_{BB}^\star$, the corresponding $\mathbf{W}_{RF}^\star$ can be calculated from Algorithm 1 in [9] where the details are omitted here for space limit.

E. Discussions

Instead of using the ideal beampattern based design to obtain the full-digital beamformer $\mathbf{w}_1^\star$, another method is to directly solve the following problem:

$$\begin{aligned}\textbf{P4}: \underset{\mathbf{w}_1}{\text{maximize}} \quad & \eta \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \left|\mathbf{w}_1^H\boldsymbol{\alpha}(\arcsin(x))\right| \ge \eta, x \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}, && (\tilde{\text{C}}.1)\\ & \left|\mathbf{w}_1^H\boldsymbol{\alpha}(\arcsin(x))\right| \le \sqrt{r_s}, x \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_s^-, && (\bar{\text{C}}.2)\\ & 0 < \Delta_T \le \Delta_T^{max}. && (\bar{\text{C}}.3)\\ & \mathbf{w}_1^H\mathbf{w}_1 \le 1. && (\bar{\text{C}}.4)\end{aligned}$$

where the object along with ($\tilde{\text{C}}$.1) is equivalent to the original one, i.e., minimizing ρ. P4 can be solved via a similar iterative optimization based algorithm to Algorithm 1.

Remark 3. *Compared with P3, P4 is a more direct formulation without using the ideal beampattern in* (9)*. Thus, only random initialization can be used for solving P4, which generally has lower convergence speed and degraded performance.*

V. Simulation and Analysis

In this section, the performance of the proposed scheme will be validated. We consider $D = 0.5$, $M = 64$, 60° sector and maximum transition bandwidth 4° unless mentioned otherwise. Thus, the ideal beampattern in the sector $\xi^\star = 2$ from Lemma 1, and r_s is set to be $\xi^\star/10^3$ which corresponds to a 30 dB attenuation outside the sector. $3M$ discrete points with equal space among $\tilde{\mathcal{A}} \cup \tilde{\mathcal{A}}^-$ are selected in P3 and P4.

In Fig. 1, the proposed scheme is compared with the ZC scheme in [3]. It can be shown that if the sector size is 180°, the ZC scheme can achieve $\xi^\star = 1$ only in or near the discrete angles corresponding to the spatial frequency set $(-M/2 : 1 : M/2-1)/(MD)$, while the proposed scheme achieves $\xi^\star = 1$ for all (more than M) observed discrete angles. For the smaller sector size 60°, the beampattern for ZC scheme within the sector is still 1 while that of the proposed scheme approaches 2 well. These improvements results from two respects. First, denser angle discretization is allowed in the proposed scheme. Second, the strict constraint of constant envelop for the ZC scheme is relaxed in the proposed scheme



Fig. 1. Comparison with the ZC scheme [3] and P4.



Fig. 2. The improvement of PAPR due to Step 3.

in which the PAPR metric is treated as an additional consideration. For the comparison with the broadbeam scheme in [6], please refer to Remark 2 and simulations are omitted for space limit. On the other hand, solving P4 with more iterations still performs worse than that of P3 in the proposed scheme, which validates Remark 3.

The PAPR of all beamformers with the same beampattern as that of $\mathbf{w}_1^\star$ are shown in Fig. 2 where $Q = 8$, i.e., 256 beamformers besides $\mathbf{w}_1^\star$ (with beamformer index 1) are created. It can be shown that after Step 3, the PAPR of $\mathbf{w}_2^\star$ can be decreased by 56%. Further, $\mathbf{w}_2^\star$ can be decomposed into $\mathbf{W}_{RF}^\star$ and $\mathbf{w}_{BB}^\star$ without error by Step 4 while the details are omitted for space limit.

VI. Conclusion

In this work, a hybrid beamforming was proposed for massive MIMO public channel with any sector size which aims to minimize the transmit power while guaranteeing the QoS of all users. The ideal beampattern was first derived via Parseval Identity, based on which a non-convex but multiconvex problem was formulated which results in the full-digital beamformer with minimum gap with the ideal beampattern. In addition, the PAPR performance was improved through a search based on the same beampattern theorem. Finally, the full-digital beamformer was perfectly implemented in the hybrid structure through the triangle construction with the predefined baseband beamformer. Simulations validated the advantages of the proposed scheme over existing ones.

Appendix A: Proof of Lemma 1

We first give a upper bound on the sum beampattern within the sector, based on which the optimal beampattern is provided.

From the Parseval Identity [13], we have

$$\frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{\pi}^{-\pi}|F(\Omega)|^2 d\Omega = \sum_{m=0}^{M-1}|w_m|^2 = \mathbf{w}^H\mathbf{w} = 1, \tag{10}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}|F(\Omega)|^2 &= \left|\sum_{m=0}^{M-1} w_m^* e^{-j\Omega m}\right|^2 = \left|\mathbf{w}^H\boldsymbol{\alpha}\left(\arcsin\left(\frac{\Omega}{2\pi D}\right)\right)\right|^2 \\ &= g\left(\arcsin\left(\frac{\Omega}{2\pi D}\right)\right).\end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\sin(\Theta_{\min})}^{\sin(\Theta_{\max})} g(\arcsin(x))dx &\overset{(a)}{=} \frac{1}{2\pi D}\int_{2\pi D\sin(\Theta_{\min})}^{2\pi D\sin(\Theta_{\max})}|F(\Omega)|^2 d\Omega \\ &\le \frac{1}{2\pi D}\int_{\pi}^{-\pi}|F(\Omega)|^2 d\Omega = \frac{1}{D},\end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

where (a) follows from defining $x \triangleq \frac{\Omega}{2\pi D}$. If $F(\Omega) = 0$ for $\Omega \in \{[-\pi, 2\pi D\sin(\Theta_{\min})] \cup [2\pi D\sin(\Theta_{\max}), \pi]\}$, $\int_{\sin(\Theta_{\min})}^{\sin(\Theta_{\max})} g(\arcsin(x))dx$ approaches the upper bound $1/D$.

Secondly, we prove that $g(\arcsin(x))$ should be constant, i.e., $g(\arcsin(x)) = c, \forall x \subseteq \tilde{\mathcal{A}}$. Assume the smallest beampattern is $g(\arcsin(x)) = c_1 < c$ for $x \in \left[\theta_1^{min}, \theta_1^{max}\right]$. Since users' PAS have random interval and profile, if there is a User i with PAS interval $\left[\theta_1^{min}, \theta_1^{max}\right]$, for this user $\lambda < \int_{\sin(\Theta_{min})}^{\sin(\Theta_{max})} f(\arcsin(x))\, c\frac{1}{\sqrt{1-x^2}}dx$ and due to (5) larger ρ is needed to guarantee the worst case performance. On the other hand, with $g(\arcsin(x)) = c, \forall x \subseteq \tilde{\mathcal{A}}$, users with any PAS interval have the same λ, increasing ρ for users with worst case performance is unnecessary.

Moreover, a larger λ or c can result in a smaller ρ while maintaining the performance. Directly based on (12), we have $c \le (D(\sin(\Theta_{\max}) - \sin(\Theta_{\min})))^{-1}$ and the equality holds for the beampattern in (9).

References

[1] J. Hoydis, S. ten Brink and M. Debbah, "Massive MIMO in the UL/DL of cellular networks: how many antennas do we need?," in *IEEE J. Sel. Areas Commun.*, vol. 31, no. 2, pp. 160-171, Feb. 2013.

[2] C. Zhang, Y. Huang, Y. Jing, et al., "Sum-rate analysis for massive MIMO downlink with joint statistical beamforming and user scheduling," *to appear in IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, April, 2017.

[3] X. Meng, X. Gao and X. G. Xia, "Omnidirectional precoding based transmission in massive MIMO systems," in *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 64, no. 1, pp. 174-186, Jan. 2016.

[4] X. Yang, W. Jiang and B. Vucetic, "A random beamforming technique for broadcast channels in multiple antenna systems," *IEEE VTC Fall*, San Francisco, CA, 2011.

[5] J. G. Andrews et al., "What will 5G be?," in *IEEE J. Sel. Areas Commun.*, vol. 32, no. 6, pp. 1065-1082, June 2014.

[6] D. Qiao, H. Qian and G. Y. Li, "Broadbeam for massive MIMO systems," in *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 64, no. 9, pp. 2365-2374, May 2016.

[7] A. Hassanien, S. A. Vorobyov and A. Khabbazibasmenj, "Transmit radiation pattern invariance in MIMO radar with application to DOA estimation," in *IEEE Signal Process. Lett.*, vol. 22, no. 10, pp. 1609-1613, Oct. 2015.

[8] O. E. Ayach, S. Rajagopal, S. Abu-Surra, et al., "Spatially sparse precoding in millimeter wave MIMO systems," in *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 1499-1513, Mar. 2014.

[9] J. Zhang, Y. Huang, J. Wang, et al., "Per-antenna constant envelope precoding and antenna subset selection: a geometric approach," in *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 64, no. 23, pp. 6089-6104, Dec. 2016.

[10] X. Zhang, A. F. Molisch and S. Kung, "Variable-phase-shift-based RF-baseband codesign for MIMO antenna selection," in *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 53, no. 11, pp. 4091-4103, Nov. 2005.

[11] H. L. Van Trees. Detection, estimation, and modulation theory, optimum array processing. John Wiley & Sons, 2004.
[12] K. Guney, M. Onay. “Optimal synthesis of linear antenna arrays using a harmony search algorithm,” *Expert Systems with Applications*, 2011, 38(12): 15455-15462.
[13] A. V. Oppenheim, A. S. Wilsky, and I. T. Young, Signals and Systems. Englewood Cliffs, NJ, USA: Prentice Hall PTR, 1983, vol. 87.
[14] F. Wang, V. Balakrishnan, P. Y. Zhou, et al., “Optimal array pattern synthesis using semidefinite programming,” in *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 51, no. 5, pp. 1172-1183, May 2003.